UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/580,165 | 05/18/2006 | Lilin Li | 97501 | 8058 |
| | 7590 12/17/200 Il Sanders, LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| | Il Sanders LLP Welsh | SARWAR, BABAR | | |
| 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| CHICAGO, IL | 60606 | 2617 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 12/17/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/580,165 | LI ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| BABAR SARWAR | 2617 | |

| В | ABAR SARWAR | 2617 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | s on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION | FOR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following repapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFF periods: | olies: (1) an amendment, affidat (with appeal fee) in compliance | vit, or other evidence, we with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing day b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advi no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | sory Action, or (2) the date set fortl r than SIX MONTHS from the maili | ng date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extenunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sho set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | sion and the corresponding amoun rtened statutory period for reply ori | t of the fee. The appropria ginally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complian filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | on thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t | o avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but (a) They raise new issues that would require further consi (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or | deration and/or search (see NC | OTE below); | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a cor NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow | | | |
| non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | rill be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and s was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Nentered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ove showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and approximately approximately and sufficient reasons. | rcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | eal and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but description See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (P1 | | in condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 13. Other: | , , , | | |
| /NICK CORSARO/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617 | /BABAR SARWAR/ Examiner, Art Unit 261 | 7 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argued about features wherein "when transmitting forward signals, different beams are made to have different time delays in the base band system so that they are not coherent with one another even when different beams carry same information"; signals of each fixed beam are reflected to sectors of base band chips" the applied art, Hopp in view Frank, reads as follows;

Frank is relied upon for the claimed limitations "when transmitting forward signals, different beams are made to have different time delays in the base band system so that they are not coherent with one another even when different beams carry same information" and "signals of each fixed beam are reflected to sectors of base band chips" Frank clearly discloses a CDMA CDMA2000, and WCDMA systems in which the reduction of the amount of the interference on forward link is performed. The system uses time or frequency offset on the signals input to an antenna to minimize interference in the regions of beam overlap. Additionally, polarization diversity can be introduced using Butler Matrices in conjunction with array elements to enhance the interference reduction. Frank's invention describes a manner in which to enhance the signal to interference ratio in the regions of beam overlap. His invention describes a system which implements a switched beam architecture to minimize nulls in the beam overlap region without requiring end-to-end calibration of the radio frequency transmit and receive and circuitry between the baseband transmit and receive processing and the antennas. Frank clearly discloses that the invention focuses upon CDMA applications, including CDMA2000 and WCDMA. Frank further discloses that commercial CDMA systems have been deployed, which operate at frequencies between 800 MHz and 1 GHz and between 1.8 GHz and 2 GHz. For the system illustrated in FIG. 5, the frequency offsets might typically be in the range of 10 Hz to 100 Hz. The typical time offsets, for the system illustrated in FIG. 4, will be in the range of 1 to 10 chips. For CDMA systems such as IS-95 and CDMA2000 1.times., the chip rate of the system is 1.2288 megachips per second, and thus a chip corresponds to 81.38 microseconds. The described technology was illustrated with 3 sectors and 4 beams per sector, which is typical. It will be understood by those of average skill in the art that this technique applies for fewer or more sectors as well as fewer or more beams per sector. For example, the same techniques can also be applied for 2, 3, 5, 6, or more beams per sector as well as to cells with 1, 2, 4, or more sectors. Thus Frank shows the claimed limitations.

Further, the applicant argued about features wherein "The device for realizing beam-forming in CDMA system comprises a digital fixed beam-forming network." Hopp's FIG. 2 in particular; discloses a wireless communication system 30. Wireless communication system 30 is a digitally adaptive beamforming antenna system having multiple M.times.N active antenna arrays 32 supported on a tower, such as on the tower top 22, which are oriented about the tower top 22 to provide the desired beam sectors for a defined cell. As shown in FIG. 7, each active antenna array 32 comprises an array of antenna elements 34 which are arranged generally in a desired pattern, such as a plurality of N vertical columns or sub-arrays 36 (designated 1-N) with M antenna elements 34 per column (designated 1-M). The M.times.N array 32 of antenna elements 34 may be formed by suitable techniques, such as by providing strip line elements or patch elements on a suitable substrate and ground plane, for example. Of course, other configurations of the array 32 are possible as well without departing from the spirit and scope of the present invention. The array of antenna elements 34 are operable to define multiple, individual beams for signals in one or more communication frequency bands. Hopp discloses as illustrated in FIG. 3, that each planar antenna array 50 incorporates a transceiver 60 operatively coupled to each vertical column or sub-array 36. Each transceiver 60 is operable to convert the digital baseband signals from a beamformer DSP 62 of the control unit 38 to RF signals for transmission by the antenna elements 34 during a "down-link". The transceivers 60 are further operable to convert RF signals received by the antenna elements 34 during an "up-link". The transceivers 60 are each coupled to the optical fiber transmission lines 42 through a multiplexer or MUX 64 and are driven by a suitable local oscillator (LO) 66. A demultiplexer or DEMUX is coupled to the beamformer DSP 62 and is further coupled to the MUX 64 through the optical fiber transmission lines 42. Generally, the transceivers 60 convert the down-link signals to a form which may be readily processed by various digital signal processing (DSP) techniques, such as channel digital signal processing, including time division techniques (TDMA) and code division techniques (CDMA). The digital signals, at that point, are in a defined digital band which is associated with the antenna signals and a communication frequency band. Thus Hopp shows the claimed limitations.